



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/575,009	12/12/2006	Horst Keller	2584SG-4	6999
23442	7590	02/06/2009		
SHERIDAN ROSS PC 1560 BROADWAY SUITE 1200 DENVER, CO 80202			EXAMINER KHATRI, PRASHANT J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1794	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/06/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/575,009

Applicant(s)

KELLER ET AL.

Examiner

PRASHANT J. KHATRI

Art Unit

1794

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 October 2008.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 October 2008 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/27/2008
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

In response to Amendments/Arguments filed 10/27/2008. Claims 1-20 are pending.

Claims 1, 4-5, 8, and 13 were amended. Claims 16-20 were added as new.

Drawings

1. The drawings were received on 10/27/2008. These drawings are acceptable.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 8 and 13 are objected to because of the following informalities: It appears the term "miner" is misspelled. Examiner assumes it is "mineral" for examination purposes. Regarding claim 13, it appears that the claim was amended. However, the claim also states that it was "Previously Presented". In the interest of furthering prosecution, Examiner assumed that the claim was amended and treated as such. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claims 6-9, 16, 17, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. Regarding claim 6, the phrase "such as" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention.

See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

6. Claim 7 recites the limitation "the mineral fiber felt" in the second line. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

7. Regarding claim 7, it is unclear what the phrase "eventually free of a fulling process" comprises.

8. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The compression ratio is unclear as the standard format for compression ratios comprises a higher number to the left of the colon mark and the lower number to the left of the colon mark, specifically "1:3" found in the last line.

9. Claim 9 recites the limitation "said section" in second line. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

10. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is not clear as to the scope of the claim given that the claim number claim 16 is depending on is missing.

11. Claims 17 and 19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims recite that the gross density is in the range of a single number. It is not clear how a single number can constitute a range.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 1-7, 10-14, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Battigelli et al. (**US 5601628**) in view of Erskine (**US 6074967**), Bernard et al. (**US 5554324**), and Vignesoult et al. (**US 6284684**) with evidence from Trabbold et al. (**WO 02/070417**).

14. Battigelli et al. disclose a method for the production of mineral wool and mineral wool produced thereof. Prior art discloses a material composition comprising common mineral-based compounds found within comparable silica-based insulation materials (**col. 9, lines 1+**). As shown by prior art, fiberization occurs at temperatures of at least 1200°C, therefore Examiner takes the position that the fusion point of the material would therefore occur at a temperature higher than 1200°C, which would meet the parameters of the present claim. It is noted, however, that prior art discloses that the formation of beads is dependent on viscosity (**col. 4, lines 35+**) and the pressure of the blower within the apparatus (**col. 8, lines 42+**). Examiner takes the position that the reduction of beads is an optimization feature and may be adjusted by varying the pressure of the blower. It is noted that the process is an internal centrifuging process in a spinner

(**abstract**). However, prior art is silent to the use of a binding, the exact claimed composition, and fiber diameters produced.

15. Erskine discloses the use of a fibrous binding agent comprised of cellulose fibers and the like (**col. 3, lines 34+**). Furthermore, the fibrous agent may be present at amounts of 5%, 7%, and 10% by weight of the total ingredients (**col. 4, lines 27+**). Examiner notes that the binding agent inclusion of an about 5% would therefore meet the present claim. Furthermore, it is noted that cellulose is considered to be an organic material and would thereby meet the presently claimed binding material.

16. Bernard et al. discloses a method for producing mineral wool. Examiner notes that this reference is incorporated by reference by Battigelli and Battigelli is incorporated into the present disclosure (**col. 18, lines 19+**). It is noted that the apparatus disclosed by prior art produces fibers having diameters of about 3.2 microns to 4.7 microns, wherein the fiber diameters are dependent on pull rate and temperature (**col. 18, lines 26+**).

17. As evidenced by Trabbold et al., a product of finer fibers can be less dense than one of coarse fibers resulting in same insulating values. Furthermore, as shown by Trabbold, the material disclosed by prior art has a density of 9 kg/m³ as a result of the processing. Examiner regards the presently claimed density as dependent on the composition and further the processing orifices which as shown by prior art effect the gram weight (**pp. 17-21; specifically disclosures on Tables 3 and 5**). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have known to produce materials that vary in density depending on the application.

18. Vignesoult et al. disclose a mineral wool composition comprising the following:

SiO ₂	39-55%,
Al ₂ O ₃	16-27%,
CaO	3-35%,
MgO	0-5%,
Na ₂ O	0-5%,
K ₂ O	0-5%,
Na ₂ O (Na ₂ O + K ₂ O)	10-17%,
P ₂ O ₅	0-3%,
F ₂ O ₃	0-5%,
B ₂ O ₃	0-6%,
TiO ₂	0-3%,

19. The disclosed ranges as shown above encompass or equal the presently claimed ranges. Prior art further discloses the composition may include 2% to 3% of unanalyzed impurities. Concerning the alkali/earth alkali ratio, Examiner notes that Ex. 2 in Table 1 shows that the ratio is less than 1 (**col. 4, lines 30-31**). Examiner takes the position that the material would therefore meet the standard presently claimed in claim 10.

20. Note that while Erskine does not disclose all the features of the present claimed invention, Erskine is used as teaching reference, and therefore, it is not necessary for this secondary reference to contain all the features of the presently claimed invention, *In re Nievelt*, 482 F.2d 965, 179 USPQ 224, 226 (CCPA 1973), *In re Keller* 624 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871, 881 (CCPA 1981). Rather this reference teaches a certain concept, namely, the use of binders in mineral wool materials in order to decrease the brittleness of the material and in combination with the primary reference, discloses the presently claimed invention.

21. All of the elements were known within the art in individual disclosures; however each is silent to containing all the elements presently claimed. The motivation to

combine Erskine to Battigelli and Bernard stems from the fact that binding agents allow for an increase in strength and decrease in brittleness when the material undergoes compression for shipping. Furthermore, it is noted that the increase in strength decreases the amount of failed products and thereby increasing consumer satisfaction. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply a binder disclosed by Erskine into the materials disclosed by Bernard and Battigelli. Additionally, the formation of beads during processing is known within the art to be the cause of product failure. Examiner notes that Battigelli discloses the formation of beads may be reduced by optimizing blower pressure. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adjust the blower pressure to minimize the formation of beads and thereby reduce product failure. Vignesoult et al. disclose a mineral wool composition that encompasses the presently claimed ranges. The motivation to use the composition into the process disclosed by Battigelli and Bernard is that the composition of Vignesoult yields a material that has satisfactory biosolubility and considered to be less environmentally and physiologically harmful to lifeforms. Thus, it would have been obvious to include this composition to create an environmentally friendly material in conjunction with the binders disclosed by Erskine, which improve strength for shipping purposes to the processes disclosed by Battigelli and Bernard. Concerning the standards that are presently claimed in claims 4-6, 10, and 12, Examiner takes the position that if the materials meet the elements that are presently claimed, the material would therefore meet the standards that are presently claimed.

22. Claim 8 and 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Battigelli et al. in view of Erskine, Bernard et al., and Vignesoult et al. with evidence from Tabbold et al. as applied to claims 1 and 7 above, and further in view of Syme et al. (**US 5900298**).

23. Battigelli et al., Erskine, and Bernard et al. are silent to the compression ratio.

24. Syme et al. disclose a mineral fiber insulation that is of a density that encompasses the presently claimed density when converted (**col. 4, lines 59+**). Additionally, prior art discloses a range for compression ratios that are suitable for shipping purposes of 4 to 10:1 (**col. 10, lines 65+**). Examiner notes that the ratios signify the roll having an uncompressed material as the first number and the second number as the compressed material. Thus, the compression ratio is equivalent to the presently claimed material as the first number is the compressed material and the second number is the uncompressed material.

25. However, note that while Syme et al. do not disclose all the features of the present claimed invention, Syme et al. is used as teaching reference, and therefore, it is not necessary for this secondary reference to contain all the features of the presently claimed invention, *In re Nievelt*, 482 F.2d 965, 179 USPQ 224, 226 (CCPA 1973), *In re Keller* 624 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871, 881 (CCPA 1981). Rather this reference teaches a certain concept; namely, the range for compression ratios suitable for shipping purposes and it would have been obvious to combine with the primary reference, in order to disclose the presently claimed invention.

26. All of the elements were known within the art. The only difference is a single disclosure containing all of the presently claimed elements. Battigelli et al., Erskine, and Bernard et al. are silent to the compression ratio. Syme et al. disclose a mineral fiber insulation that is of a density that encompasses the presently claimed density when converted. Additionally, prior art discloses a range for compression ratios that are suitable for shipping purposes of 4 to 10:1. The motivation to combine the references is drawn towards a material that is capable of being transported without damaging the material. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to produce a material that has the above compression ratios so shipping can be maximized and then produce a batt that can decompress into a normal size.

27. Claims 9 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Battigelli et al. in view of Erskine and Bernard et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bihy et al. (**DE3612857**).

28. Battigelli et al., Erskine, and Bernard et al. disclose the above but are silent to the use of markings as cutting aids and within a system for clamping insulation material between rafters.

29. Bihy et al. show the use of cutting markings that appears to be the exact same as the claimed invention. Figure 1 of prior art shows the marking regions wherein a knife or other cutting instrument may be used to cut an appropriate amount of material for use as insulation. Concerning claim 15, prior art discloses a mineral fiber insulating material to be used as a roof rafter clamping material between adjacent beams (**FIG. 2**).

30. Note that while Bihiy et al. do not disclose all the features of the present claimed invention, Bihiy et al. is used as teaching reference, and therefore, it is not necessary for this secondary reference to contain all the features of the presently claimed invention, *In re Nievelt*, 482 F.2d 965, 179 USPQ 224, 226 (CCPA 1973), *In re Keller* 624 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871, 881 (CCPA 1981). Rather this reference teaches a certain concept, namely, the use of mineral wool materials as roof insulation materials and in combination with the primary reference, discloses the presently claimed invention. All of the elements were known within the art individually but not within a single disclosure for all of the claimed elements. Bihiy et al. disclose a mineral fiber insulation material that has markings on the surface for cutting purposes and further the system for applying the material to roof rafters. The motivation to combine is drawn from the fact the material disclosed when combined by Battigelli et al., Erskine, and Bernard et al. provide for an environmentally safe and strong material that will provide excellent thermal insulation properties. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply a binder material for shipping purposes and further, markings for sizing purposes. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take advantage of the mineral insulation in a system wherein the insulation is aligned and clamped down between beams to take advantage of the environmentally-friendly elements and strength elements for a superior product compared to comparable products within the marketplace.

Response to Arguments

31. Applicant's arguments, see p. 17 regarding some of the 112 rejections, filed 10/27/2008, with respect to claims 1, 4, and 5 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of the above claims has been withdrawn. Applicant's amendment filed 10/27/08 overcomes the 112, second rejections of record with respect to claims 1, 4, and 5. It is noted that the rejections with respect to claims 6-9 have been maintained since applicants do not appear to have addressed these rejections in the amendment.

Applicant's arguments filed 10/27/2008 regarding the Bernard, Battigelli, and Vignesoult references have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. While Examiner acknowledges the mirconaire values, the references are still viable to the overall patentability of the present claims. Furthermore, it is unclear as to what Applicant is asserting regarding the "inability to be clamped between beams" given that the references were used as obviousness types. Examiner would like to further add that the use of mineral wool as disclosed by the prior art is well-known to form into material plates and is implicit to the disclosure. It is also noted that the rolling and separable material plates are presently claimed as options for formation. Further, note that while Vignesoult and Bernard do not disclose all the features of the present claimed invention, the above are used as teaching references, and therefore, it is not necessary for this secondary reference to contain all the features of the presently claimed invention, *In re Nievelt*, 482 F.2d 965, 179 USPQ 224, 226 (CCPA 1973), *In re Keller* 624 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871, 881 (CCPA 1981). Rather these reference teaches a certain concept,

namely, the composition and process in order to for insulating materials and in combination with the primary reference, discloses the presently claimed invention.

32. Applicant's arguments filed 10/27/2008 regarding the Erskine reference have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Erskine was used a secondary reference. Please see paragraph 21 for further details. It is also noted that the Erskine is drawn to insulating material and the reference is used for the presently claimed "organic binder".

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PRASHANT J. KHATRI whose telephone number is (571)270-3470. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 A.M.-5:00 P.M. (First Friday Off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Callie Shosho can be reached on (571) 272-1123. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PRASHANT J KHATRI
Examiner
Art Unit 1794

/Callie E. Shosho/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1794